

Report of the Nomenclature Committee for Algae: 15

Willem F. Prud'homme van Reine

Downloaded from:

<https://doi.org/10.12705%2F661.16>

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act (DCA) - End User Rights

This publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act (Auteurswet) with consent from the author. Dutch law entitles the maker of a short scientific work funded either wholly or partially by Dutch public funds to make that work publicly available following a reasonable period after the work was first published, provided that reference is made to the source of the first publication of the work.

This publication is distributed under the Naturalis Biodiversity Center 'Taverne implementation' programme. In this programme, research output of Naturalis researchers and collection managers that complies with the legal requirements of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act is distributed online and free of barriers in the Naturalis institutional repository. Research output is distributed six months after its first online publication in the original published version and with proper attribution to the source of the original publication.

You are permitted to download and use the publication for personal purposes. All rights remain with the author(s) and copyrights owner(s) of this work. Any use of the publication other than authorized under this license or copyright law is prohibited.

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the department of Collection Information know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, Collection Information will make the material inaccessible. Please contact us through email: collectie.informatie@naturalis.nl. We will contact you as soon as possible.

Report of the Nomenclature Committee for Algae: 15

Willem F. Prud'homme van Reine

Naturalis Biodiversity Center, P.O. Box 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands; Willem.Prudhommevanreine@naturalis.nl

DOI <https://doi.org/10.12705/661.16>

Summary Three names are recommended for conservation against the names indicated: *Gelidium bipectinatum* (Rhodophyceae) against *Fucus serra*; *Scrippsiella* (Dinophyceae) against *Heteraulacus* and *Goniodoma*; and *Gloeobacter violaceus* (Cyanophyceae) against *Aphanothece caldarium*, *Gloeotheca coerulea*, and *Gloeotheca linearis*, while two names are recommended for conservation with a conserved type: *Chara hispida* (Characeae) and *Gloeotheca* (Cyanophyceae). Three names are recommended for outright rejection, *Jania verrucosa* (Rhodophyceae), *Cyanospira* (Cyanophyceae) and *Goniodomataceae* (Dinophyceae), but the name *Gonyaulax catenella* (Dinophyceae) should not be rejected. The Committee concluded that the names *Geisleria* Nitschke (Fungi) and *Geissleria* Lange-Bert. & Metzeltin (*Bacillariophyceae*) are not sufficiently alike to be confused.

The Nomenclature Committee for Algae (previous Report 14 in Taxon 65: 880–881. Aug 2016) currently comprises the same 13 members as listed in NCA report 14. The ballot for the proposals discussed below was completed by all members, thus under the 60% rule 8 “yes” votes were necessary for a proposal to be recommended and also 8 for rejection. The votes are recorded in the order yes – no – abstention.

Proposals to conserve or reject names

(2194) Proposal to conserve the name *Gloeobacter violaceus* against *Aphanothece caldarium*, *Gloeotheca coerulea*, and *Gloeotheca linearis* (Cyanophyceae). Proposed by J. Mareš & al. in Taxon 62: 1055. 2013. Votes 13–0–0 (recommended).

(2195) Proposal to conserve the name *Gloeotheca* (Cyanophyceae) with a conserved type. Proposed by J. Mareš & al. in Taxon 62: 1056. 2013. Votes 13–0–0 (recommended).

Committee members had extensive discussions on Proposals 2194 and 2195, including preliminary but conflicting voting.

Gloeotheca linearis, a name proposed for rejection in Proposal 2194, is the type of *Gloeotheca*, the generic name involved in Proposal 2195. In Proposal 2195, the authors propose conservation of the name *Gloeotheca* with a new type, *Gloeotheca fuscolutea* Nägeli, allowing its use in the traditional sense, and rejecting the originally designated type, *G. linearis*. *Gloeotheca fuscolutea* was also described by Nägeli (1849) in the same paper in which he published his new genus *Gloeotheca*. The authors of Proposal 2195 did not mention that Nägeli (1849) included *G. fuscolutea* in *Gloeotheca* with some doubt (“wahrscheinlich auch *G. fuscolutea* (*Gloeocapsa* f. Næg.)”), a concern raised in relation to the original assessment of Proposal 2195, but considered after 167 years to no longer form a taxonomic concern, particularly as Nägeli clearly accepted it in *Gloeotheca* by making the new combination.

The Committee benefitted from clarification from Jan Mareš, the first author of both proposals, as to why the authors of Proposal 2195 chose *Gloeotheca fuscolutea* rather than *G. confluens* as the proposed new type of *Gloeotheca*. It was also useful to be advised of the diacritical features of the genus as it is currently understood and to learn that a publication on the monophyletic cluster corresponding to the modern concept of *Gloeotheca* is in preparation.

In light of these explanations, both Proposals 2194 and 2195 are recommended.

(2273) Proposal to conserve the name *Gelidium bipectinatum* against *Fucus serra* (*Gelidium serra*) (Rhodophyta: Gelidiaceae).

Proposed by G. Furnari & al. in Taxon 63: 427–428. 2014. Votes 8–5–0 (recommended).

The authors of Proposal 2273 proposed conserving the name *Gelidium bipectinatum* G. Furnari, but several Committee members suggested choosing *Gelidium pectinatum* Mont. instead. The latter name was illegitimate when published, because Montagne recorded the older name *Fucus serra* S.G. Gmelin as a synonym, and hence, without its being conserved with a conserved type, it is homotypic with *F. serra*.

The only known original material of *Fucus serra* is a drawing (as *Fucus humilis*) in the pre-Linnaean publication of Buxbaum (1728). This drawing was designated the lectotype of *Fucus serra*. The Buxbaum drawing, however, probably does not depict a species of *Gelidium*, nor a species of *Caulerpa* (as was suggested in Proposal 2273).

In general, Proposal 2273 is clear, well-documented and provides full consideration of alternative ways in which the matter can be resolved. The name *Gelidium bipectinatum* is probably the best choice, because conservation of the name *G. pectinatum* Mont. has not been proposed, so for *G. pectinatum* to be chosen, a new conservation proposal would need to be published.

(2302) Proposal to reject the name *Gonyaulax catenella* (*Alexandrium catenella*) (Dinophyceae). Proposed by U. Hohn & al. in Taxon 63: 932–933. 2014. Votes 1–12–0 (not recommended).

The Committee found the arguments against this proposal published in a separate paper by S. Fraga & al. (in Taxon 64: 634–635. 2015) more compelling than the arguments presented by the authors of Proposal 2302 and thus voted not to recommend this proposal.

No attempted typification is recorded in this proposal, even though illustrations of most involved taxa are available and lectotypification would have been possible. In addition, *Alexandrium fundyense* and *A. catenella* are certainly conspecific, and then “*catenella*” has nomenclatural priority.

(2303) Proposal to conserve the name *Chara hispida* (Characeae) with a conserved type. Proposed by T. Gregor & al. in Taxon 63: 933–934. 2014. Votes 13–0–0 (recommended).

The case for conserving the name *Chara hispida* is clearly set out, logical, and strong, and in the interests of nomenclatural stability, even though many other names have been used in the older literature. Application of the name *Chara hispida* to the species currently known as *C. aspera* would not favor the goal of nomenclatural stability.

(2340) Proposal to reject the name *Jania verrucosa* (Rhodophyta: Corallinaceae). Proposed by W.J. Woelkerling & al. in Taxon 64: 167. 2015. Votes 12–0–1 (recommended).

Committee members consulted the associated background article by Woelkerling & al. published in Taxon 64: 137–146. 2015. The primary purpose of Proposal 2340 is to promote long-term nomenclatural stability in the application of names to species of coralline red algae. All responding members considered the solution of rejecting the name *Jania verrucosa* a very clear one.

(2365) Proposal to conserve the name *Cyanospira* G. Florenz. & al. (Cyanophyceae) against *Cyanospira* Chodat (Euglenophyceae). Proposed by Jurán & al. in Taxon 64: 845–846. 2015. Votes 0–13–0 (not recommended).

All responding members indicated that they do not support (thus reject) this proposal, which is characterized as inconceivable and opposed to the present-day rules. Although the generic name was validated in 2015 (in Taxon 64: 845), it is still illegitimate because of homonymy with *Cyanospira* Chodat 1921. The warning, in the proposal, that creation of a new name could lead to later confusion and that the new name would be overlooked, ignored, or rejected by a substantial number of physiologists and molecular biologists is contrary to the spirit of Preamble 1 of the ICN (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 154. 2012), and in effect defiant of the overall purpose of the ICN.

(2382) Proposal to conserve the name *Scrippsiella* against *Heteraulacus* and *Goniodoma* (Thoracosphaeraceae, Dinophyceae). Proposed by M. Gottschling & M. Elbrächter in Taxon 64: 1051–1052. 2015. Votes 10–3–0 (recommended).

This proposal to conserve the name *Scrippsiella* against *Heteraulacus* and *Goniodoma* (Thoracosphaeraceae, Dinophyceae), is based on the much more detailed and informative 2015 paper of Kretschmann & al. entitled “Taxonomic clarification of the dinophyte *Peridinium acuminatum* Ehrenb., = *Scrippsiella acuminata*, comb. nov. (Thoracosphaeraceae, Peridiniales)”, published in Phytotaxa 220(3): 239–256. 2015 and available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.11646/phytotaxa.220.3.3>.

The name *Scrippsiella* Balech ex A.R. Loeblich 1959 is not an old name and some members suggested that not much nomenclatural upheaval would occur should the name *Heteraulacus* Diesing 1850 be used again. Therefore one can propose to protect priority over nomenclatural instability when (as in the present case) the instability is not great. However, based on present data in AlgaeBase, 31 of 42 names involving *Scrippsiella* are treated as currently accepted taxonomically while none of the 9 names involving *Heteraulacus* are treated as currently accepted taxonomically. These data suggest that approval of Proposal 2382 strongly supports nomenclatural stability whereas rejection of the proposal would result in considerable nomenclatural upheaval as at least 31 currently recognized species of *Scrippsiella* would have to be transferred to the genus *Heteraulacus*.

The confusion involving *Peridinium acuminatum* came from two concepts: *P. acuminatum* Ehrenberg and *P. acuminatum* F. Stein. The former is what is thought to involve a *Scrippsiella*, the latter is a misidentification of material by Stein, which is now known to belong to *Triadinium* or *Pyrrothotriadinium*. However, Stein misunderstood the Ehrenberg description as also including the Stein material and many researchers followed him. Nevertheless, *Peridinium acuminatum* Ehrenberg is the basionym of *Heteraulacus acuminatus* (Ehrenberg) Diesing 1850, *Goniodoma acuminatum* (Ehrenberg) F. Stein 1883 and *Scrippsiella acuminata* (Ehrenberg) Kretschmann & al. 2015, and these names are therefore all homotypic.

Although Balech (1959: 195) considered his material to be algal (phytoplankton), he did not validly publish the generic name *Scrippsiella* or the species name *S. sweeneyi* because he did not provide the then required Latin descriptions or diagnoses (Art. 44.1 of the ICN). Thus Balech (1959: 195) is not the author of the name of the genus. The correct author's citation for the genus *Scrippsiella* is (Art. 46.5) *Scrippsiella* Balech ex A.R. Loeblich or *Scrippsiella* A.R. Loeblich. The name of the genus and its species *S. sweeneyi* were published simultaneously with a single description (“descriptio generico-specifica”, Art. 38.5).

The lectotypification of *Peridinium acuminatum* is not clearly explained in Proposal 2382. In the protologue, Ehrenberg (1836: 541, 575, figs. 5a, 5b, 5c) included three water-colour illustrations without designating a type. The authors of Proposal 2382 chose one of the original water colour illustrations as lectotype.

(2383) Proposal to reject the name *Goniodomataceae* (Dinophyceae). Proposed by M. Elbrächter & M. Gottschling in Taxon 64: 1052–1053. 2015. Votes 13–0–0 (recommended).

The case for rejecting the name *Goniodomataceae* is straightforward and clear, and recommending approval is consistent with recommending approval of Proposal 2382.

The correct name for this family in the order *Peridinales* is *Thoracosphaeraceae* J. Schiller 1930, a senior synonym of *Heteraulacaceae* Loeblich & Drugg (in Taxon 17: 90. 1968).

Request for a binding decision

(25) Request for a binding decision on whether *Geisleria* Nitschke (Ascomycota: Strigulaceae) and *Geissleria* Lange-Bert. & Metzeltin (Bacillariophyceae: Naviculaceae) are sufficiently alike to be confused. Requested by S. Blanco & C.E. Wetzel in Taxon 64: 647. 2015. Votes 4–9–0 (recommended not to treat as homonyms).

Most members of our Committee thought that it is unlikely that the names *Geisleria* and *Geissleria* will be confused in scientific literature while some thought they were similar enough to be considered homonyms. Treating the two names as homonyms, however, could lead to nomenclatural destabilization. We await the recommendation of the Nomenclature Committee for Fungi.